

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
EUGENE DIVISION

MID-VALLEY ORAL, MAXILLOFACIAL  
& IMPLANT SURGERY, P.C., an Oregon  
domestic professional corporation,

Case No. 6:18-cv-01068-MK  
**ORDER**

Plaintiff,

vs.

SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY,  
LTD, aka SENTINEL INSURANCE  
COMPANY, LIMITED, a foreign corporation;  
THE HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES  
GROUP, INC., a foreign corporation, aka  
THE HARTFORD; and HARTFORD FIRE  
INSURANCE COMPANY, a foreign  
corporation,

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, Judge:

Magistrate Judge Russo filed her Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) (doc. 9) on August 27, 2018. The matter is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. There are no objections to the F&R. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a *de novo* review, I retain the obligation to “make an informed, final determination.” *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), *overruled on other grounds*, *United*

*States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. *Ray v. Astrue*, 2012 WL 1598239, \*1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory Committee, I review the F&R for “clear error on the face of the record[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also *United States v. Vonn*, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, “[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of” a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case, I find no clear error.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that I adopt Judge Russo’s F&R (doc. 9).

Dated this 27<sup>th</sup> day of September 2018.



Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge